



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,469	12/14/2001	Vivek Nirke	MSI-928US	5249
22801	7590	07/10/2008		
LEE & HAYES PLLC				
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500				
SPOKANE, WA 99201				
EXAMINER				
DINH, KHANH Q				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2151				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/10/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/017,469
Filing Date: December 14, 2001
Appellant(s): NIRKHE ET AL.

Brian J. Pangrie (Reg. No.42,973)
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 4/28/2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 10/30/2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

5,654,490	BLAKELY	2-1997
6,578,078	SMITH	6-2003
6,826,692	WHITE	11-2004

6,564,261

GUDJONSSON

6,564,261

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6, 11, 13-17, 19-24, 26-39 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakley et al., US pat. No.5,604,490 (hereafter Blakley) in view of Smith et al, US pat. No.6,578,078 (hereafter Smith). As to claim 1, Blakley discloses a method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising:

receiving on a computer in a first network (a subsystem of fig.1) a user name associated with a user in the first network, wherein the first network uses a first operating system and mapping the user name to a user name associated with the user in a second network (other subsystem of fig.1) and mapping the user name associated with the same user in the second network to a user identification number (user identification) associated with the user in the second network [using the operating

system for mapping unique pairs (user handles and user names) into its own view with users' credentials and access privileges, see abstract, figs. 1, 2, 3A, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57 and col.5 lines 1-28].

Blakley does not specifically disclose users at the two networks using different operating systems. However, Smith discloses that users at the two networks use different operating systems (users access different network operating systems such as Unix and MS-DOS, see fig.6, abstract, col.5 lines 7-45 and col.19 line 20 to col.20 line 18). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32).

As to claims 2 and 3, Blakley discloses accessing resources on a computer in the second network using the user identification number and authenticating the user after the mappings (using authentication service UAS, see col.4 lines 15-58).

As to claims 4 and 6, Blakley discloses that first network uses a personal computer based operating system and a gateway (28 fig.1) (see fig.1, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57).

As to claim 11, Blakley discloses a computer-readable medium storing computer-executable instructions to map a user name associated with a user in a first network (a subsystem of fig.1) that uses a first operating system to a user name associated with a user in a second network (other subsystem of fig.1) and to map the user name associated with the user in the second network to a user identification number (user identification) associated with the user in the second network [see abstract, figs.1, 2, 3A, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57 and col.5 lines 1-28].

Blakley does not specifically disclose users at the two networks using different operating systems. However, Smith discloses that users at the two networks use different operating systems (users access different network operating systems such as Unix and MS-DOS, see fig.6, abstract, col.5 lines 7-45 and col.19 line 20 to col.20 line 18). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32).

As to claim 13, Blakley discloses a method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising: receiving on a computer in a first network (a subsystem of fig.1) using a first operating system a user name and a password associated with a user in a second network (other cluster 1 fig.6); authenticating the user using the user name and the password to produce an authenticated user and mapping the authenticated user to

a user identification number associated with the user in a second network (another subsystem of fig.1) (using user authentication service and user's mapping to provide security information to user based on user ID and password when user login to other subsystems or networks, see abstract, figs.1, 2, 3A, col.1 lines 42-53, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57 and col.5 lines 1-28).

Blakley does not specifically disclose users at the two networks using different operating systems. However, Smith discloses that users at the two networks use different operating systems (users access different network operating systems such as Unix and MS-DOS, see fig.6, abstract, col.5 lines 7-45 and col.19 line 20 to col.20 line 18). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32).

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 2.

As to claims 15-17, Blakley discloses the first network performing the authenticating, mapping, using a personal computer based operating system (see fig.1, col.1 lines 42-53 and col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57).

Claims 19-23 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 6-10 respectively.

As to claim 24, Blakley discloses a computer-readable medium storing computer instructions to receive on a computer network (a subsystem of fig.1) a user name and a password associated with a user in a second network (other subsystem in fig.1) using a operating system, to authenticate the user using the user name and the password to produce an authenticated user (using user authentication service to provide security information to user based on user ID and password, see abstract, figs.1, 2, 3A, col.1 lines 42-53) and to map the authenticated user to a user identification number associated with the user in a second network (see fig.2, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57 and col.5 lines 1-28).

Blakley does not specifically disclose users at the two networks using different operating systems. However, Smith discloses that users at the two networks use different operating systems (users access different network operating systems such as Unix and MS-DOS, see fig.6, abstract, col.5 lines 7-45 and col.19 line 20 to col.20 line 18). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32).

As to claim 26, Blakley discloses a method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising: receiving on a computer in a second network (a subsystem of fig.1)

a user identification number (User ID) associated with a user in a first network using a first network operating system (other subsystem of fig.1) and mapping the user identification number to a user name associated with the same user in the second network, wherein the user's user identification number maps to more than one user name for the user in the heterogeneous network (using user authentication service to provide security information to user based on user ID and password, see abstract, figs.1, 2, 3A, col.1 lines 42-53, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57 and col.5 lines 1-28). Blakley does not specifically disclose users at the two networks using different operating systems. However, Smith discloses that users at the two networks use different operating systems (users access different network operating systems such as Unix and MS-DOS, see fig.6, abstract, col.5 lines 7-45 and col.19 line 20 to col.20 line 18). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32).

As to claim 27, Blakley discloses accessing resources on a computer in the second network using the user name (see fig.1, col.1 lines 42-53 and col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57).

Art Unit: 2145

Claims 28-30 and 32-36 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 15-17 and 19-23 respectively.

Claims 37 and 38 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 24 and 25 respectively.

As to claims 39 and 43, Blakley discloses a method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising: receiving on a computer in a first network (a subsystem of fig.1) a user name associated with a user in the first network; mapping the user name to a user name associated with the user in a second network (other subsystem of fig.1) and mapping the user name associated with the same user in the second network to a user identification number associated with the user in the second network, wherein the mapping includes using a map on a mapping server and the mapping server maintains a default map, a simple map and/or explicit maps that provide override; wherein the user's user identification number maps to more than one user name for the user in the heterogeneous network (using user authentication services and users' mapping to provide security information to user based on user ID and password when users login to other subsystems or networks, see abstract, figs.1, 2, 3A, col.1 lines 42-53, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57 and col.5 lines 1-28).

Blakley does not specifically disclose users at the two networks using different operating systems. However, Smith discloses that users at the two networks use different operating systems (users access different network operating systems such as Unix and

MS-DOS, see fig.6, abstract, col.5 lines 7-45 and col.19 line 20 to col.20 line 18). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32).

3. Claims 7-10, 40, 41, 42 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakley and Smith and further in view of White, US pat. No.6,826,692 (hereafter White).

As to claim 41, Blakley discloses a method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising: receiving on a computer in a first network a user name and a password associated with a user in a second network and authenticating the user using the user name and the password to produce an authenticated user; (using authentication service and users' mapping that handles clients' access to the clusters 1, see col.11 lines 5-64) and mapping the authenticated user to a user identification number associated with the user in a second network (other cluster of fig.6) (using user authentication service to provide security information to user based on user ID and password, see abstract, figs.1, 2, 3A, col.1 lines 42-53 and col.4 line 33 to col.5 line 36). Blakley does not specifically disclose users at the two networks using different operating systems. However, Smith discloses that users at the two networks use different

Art Unit: 2145

operating systems (users access different network operating systems such as Unix and MS-DOS, see fig.6, abstract, col.5 lines 7-45 and col.19 line 20 to col.20 line 18). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32). Neither Blakley nor Smith specifically discloses wherein the mapping includes using a map on a mapping server and the mapping server maintains a default map, a simple map and/or explicit maps that provide override. However, White discloses the mapping includes using a map on a mapping server and the mapping server maintains a default map, a simple map and/or explicit maps that provide override (see figs.1, 2, col.7 line 63 to col.8 line 67 and col.9 lines 1-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement White's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to process data information in a communication network because it would have established a network connection, logged a user onto the network without returning login functions to the user workstation (see White's col.9 lines 19-65).

As to claims 40, 42 and 44, White discloses algorithms for unmapping users, mapping multiple users and/or group mapping (see figs.1, 2, col.7 line 63 to col.8 line 67 and col.9 lines 1-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to implement White's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to process data information in a communications network because it would have established a network connection, logged a user onto the network without returning login functions to the user workstation (see White's col.9 lines 19-65).

As to claims 7-10, White discloses a client, a map on a mapping server and mapping including using remote procedure calls and the remote procedure calls comprise at least one remote procedure call selected from the group consisting of getting credentials, authenticating using credentials, checking map status, and dumping maps remote procedure calls (see figs.1, 2, col.7 line 63 to col.8 line 67 and col.9 lines 1-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement White's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to process data information in a communications network because it would have established a network connection, logged a user onto the network without returning login functions to the user workstation (see White's col.9 lines 19-65).

4. Claims 5, 12, 18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakley and Smith in view of Gudjonsson, US pat. No.6,564,261.

Blakley and Smith's teachings still applied as in item 3 above. Neither Blakley nor Smith specifically discloses using a graphical user interface and a UNIX based operating system. However, Gudjonsson discloses using a graphical user interface and

Art Unit: 2145

a UNIX based operating system (a standard GUI program with a persistent connection to the server, see col.34 lines 26-55 and col.38 lines 1-53). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Gudjonsson's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to process data information in a communications network because it would have provided program displays certain icons, buttons, dialogue boxes in its windows on the screen in a communications network and enabled communication services between users to connect to each others in a variety of network operating systems.

(10) Response to Argument

- Appellant asserts that the prior Art (Blakely) teaches away/does not support motivation.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner respectfully point out that Blakely also suggests providing user access to resources on servers with different operating systems such as DOS, OS/2, Macintosh (see col.1 lines 19-40). Therefore, Blakley (the primary reference) also supports the motivation to combine the references.

- Appellant asserts that the proposed modification would change principle of operation.

Examiner respectfully point out that it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32). Examiner provided the good motivation to combine the references of Blakely and Smith as shown in the secondary reference (Smith). Therefore, Examiner respectfully submits that the proposed modification would not change the principle of the operation.

- Appellant asserts that the evidence insufficient to support reasonable expectation of success.

Examiner respectfully point out that it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32). Examiner has provided a sufficient motivation to combine the references of Blakely and Smith as shown in the secondary reference (Smith). Therefore, the Appellant's arguments are not persuasive.

- Appellant asserts that the Blakly reference does not disclose a map on a mapping server.

Examiner respectfully point out that Blakly reference discloses a map on a mapping server (Gateway Server 28 fig.1) [implementing the Gateway Server to control users' access to the subsystems (network 8 and network 10 of fig.1) and using the operating system for mapping unique pairs (user handles and user names) into its own view with users' credentials and access privileges when users access to all security

Art Unit: 2145

subsystems on the system, see abstract, figs. 1, 2, 3A, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57 and col.5 lines 1-28]. The purpose of the mapping function is to ensure that the user names representing the same users to all security subsystems on the system.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Khanh Dinh/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2151

Conferees:

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151

/Jason D Cardone/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145